		Date : April 25, 2006
		Time : 9:00 – 11:00 a.m.
		Location : LC II, Room 340
Attendees:		
Neal Albritton (DOR)	Shayn Anderson (EDD)	Steve Branson (DHS)
	Donna Freeman (FTB)	☐ Theresa Giles (DHS)
☐ Jeff Hillard (CDFA)		Patrick Johnson (DOR)
Anamarie Malone (DTS)	Liz Mechem (Insurance)	Claudina Nevis (SCIO)
☐ Joni Ogata (DMHC)	Kristine Ogilvie (CSL)	Rob Quigley (SCIO)
Deborah Schwartz (CRB)	☐ Rick Vagg (DTS)	☐ Dan Whetstone (DTS)
Review Minutes from Previous Meeting		Debbie Schwartz
The minutes for the April 11 th a	nd April 18 th meetings were appr	oved with no changes.

Conference Call with State of Washington

Working Group

During the second half of the meeting, the working group held a conference call with the State of Washington to discuss how they addressed accessibility, usability, and findability in their recent portal efforts.

Open Issues Debbie Schwartz

- 1. How can the state design templates for current technology standards while accommodating departments with a wide range of expertise and software tools?

 The Review Board noted that some content management solutions can resolve this issue, but not all departments have strong content management systems in place. DTS is considering offering support. It was recommended at the IOUCA meeting on March 14th that we consider offering a resource gallery of images that can be used by any state department. It would be possible to offer a suite of templates using different color palettes that meet accessibility requirements. Before this can be decided, the issue of single look-and-feel for all California pages vs. multiple look-and-feel with common branding needs to be resolved at a higher policy level.
- 2. How can California enforce the standards after adoption? California will likely approach adoption from an incentive perspective rather than an enforcement perspective. An exception is Section 508 compliance, which is mandated by state and federal law.
- 3. Should tools to implement standards (CSS, templates) be developed for current look and feel as well as new look and feels?
- 4. Guidelines are not always followed. Would it be better to develop standards only, but drive by level of compliance? For example,

- Level 1 Standards: Minimal accessibility

- Level 2 Standards: Moderate accessibility

Level 3 Standards: High accessibility

Departments could be encouraged to work toward improving their websites by qualifying for higher levels. The state could provide "paths to accessibility" and could provide training for each level.

5. Should IOUCA set up a Webmasters Forum?

The current Webmasters IT Forum serves this purpose. We can request that the system send an email alert every time a message is received. The working group may want to assign watching the forum to a single person so the entire team isn't inundated with emails. The group may also want to consider developing and posting an FAQ on the State CIO's website to minimize questions and promote communication. Steve will provide a recommendation at the April 18th meeting. This is being addressed as an action item; the issue will be closed.

Action Items Kris Ogilvie

ACTION: Complete the accessibility standards and guidelines workbook.

Assigned To: Neal Albritton

Due: April 25, 2006 (Update)

Update: Complete. Neal will make some minor changes and send electronically.

Donna will post the standards on the working group website.

ACTION: Post amended list of usability recommendations and FTB's implementation status on working group website.

Assigned To: Donna Freeman

Due: April 25, 2006

Update: Complete. Donna sent the request to post by noon.

ACTION: Draft usability standards, guidelines, and best practices.

Assigned To: Donna Freeman

Due: May 2, 2006

Update: Donna is sorting through the federal government's usability standards at

www.usability.gov.

ACTION: Develop a beginner's version of the workbook.

Assigned To: Neal Albritton

Due: May 9, 2006 (Update)

Update: In progress

ACTION: Develop a list of file types and versions that should be used for California web pages. The list should be prioritized by most desirable and focused on where we want to be in the future rather than where we are now.

(*Note: formerly two action items* – "Identify formats currently being used on California web page" *and* "Using the list of formats currently being used on California web pages, note which formats are completely accessible, and identify conversion options for formats that are not completely accessible").

Assigned To: Neal Albritton, Steve Branson, Steve Clemons

Due: May 2, 2006 (Update)

Update: Neal met separately with Steve Branson and Steve Clemons yesterday. They need to schedule a meeting with Adobe to discuss accessibility for users with low vision; our primary Adobe representative is on vacation. After meeting with Adobe, they will develop a recommendation on file types that can be used to present content in an accessible manner. Due to schedule constraints, Neal, Steve, and Steve cannot write the recommendation. They will provide the information; Debbie will meet with the group to determine if she can write the recommendation.

Adobe sent the IOUCA CD's addressing how to make Adobe PDF's accessible; they were distributed to the team. Debbie has two extra CD's.

ACTION: Discuss a process for disseminating information to content providers and webmasters quickly. Prepare a plan to establish ongoing communication with webmasters.

Assigned To: John Jewell and Dan Whetstone

Due: May 9, 2006 (Update)

Update: In progress. John and Dan expect feedback from the April 28th IT Leaders meeting. They are working on defining an IT Forum. Some departments have expressed concern about how we will communicate with their webmasters and content managers; they want to be able to control the flow of information. We need an official list for communications.

ACTION: Follow up on the feasibility of using GTC, Executive Institute, and CIO Academy as vehicles for ongoing training.

Assigned To: Claudina Nevis and Liz Mecham

Due: May 23, 2006 (Update)

Update: In progress. Claudina is discussing the issue.

ACTION: Prepare a plan to establish ongoing communication with webmasters; may want to organize along the lines of the federal government's content managers forum.

Assigned To: John Jewell, Anamarie Malone, Rick Vagg

Due: April 25, 2006 (Update)

Update: Closed. This should be part of the larger process for disseminating information. Move into action item to "Discuss a process for disseminating information to content providers and webmasters".

ACTION: Provide a recommendation regarding IOUCA's use of the Webmaster's IT Forum and an FAQ posting on the State CIO's website (see Issue #5).

Assigned To: Steve Branson Due: May 2, 2006 (Update)

Update: If we create a topic in the general IT Forum, users would need to scroll down to find the IOUCA messages. Setting up a separate forum or a sub-forum would separate our messages and add a link at the top of the page. It was recommended that if we set up a separate or a sub-forum that we consider including all of the portal redesign elements such as IOUCA, CEAP, and the Portal Redesign Project. The name should be broad enough to encompass these and future related topics. John, Dan, and Steve Clemons will meet to discuss the appropriate name and scope for our forum.

ACTION: Document the CSS recommendation for working group review and approval.

Assigned To: Debbie Schwartz

Due: May 2, 2006 (Update)

Update: Debbie provided an outline with the minutes; the working group will discuss

it next week.

ACTION: Post the workbook on the IOUCA working group website.

Assigned To: Neal Albritton/Donna Freeman

Due: May 2, 2006 (Update)

Next Steps

Kris Ogilvie, Debbie Schwartz

Next IOUCA Meeting: May 2, 2006

Library & Courts II, 900 N Street, Room 340

9:00 - 11:00 a.m.